

BRICS: Walking Towards a Common Security Agenda

BRICS: Caminhando Rumo a uma Agenda de Segurança Comum

Luis Filipe de Souza Porto¹

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this paper is to show how each BRICS country can concatenate its international security interests in order to shape a common security agenda among the group. Thus, the purpose is to elucidate that the group can play a decisive and deeper role not only in economic issues, but also in other important international affairs.

Key-words: BRICS; International Security Agenda; Multilateralism

RESUMO

O principal objetivo deste artigo é mostrar como cada país do BRICS pode concatenar os seus interesses de segurança internacional, a fim de dar forma a uma agenda comum de segurança no grupo. Assim, o objetivo central é elucidar que o grupo pode desempenhar um papel decisivo e mais profundo, não só em questões econômicas, mas também em outros assuntos internacionais importantes.

Palavras-chave: BRICS; Agenda de Segurança Internacional; Multilateralismo.

INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to demonstrate the challenges faced by the BRICS group on developing a unique and own security agenda, which is gradually taking shape, force and prominence within the international community. Through a methodological tool better known as Discourse Analysis, we will analyze the joint statements issued at the end of each BRICS Summit in order to find consonances and evidences that a new security agenda is taking form.

¹ Defense and Strategic Studies student at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) and member of the Strategic and Institutional Studies Laboratory (LEEI/UFRJ) on the BRICs and Latin America group
Conjuntura Global, Vol. 4, n. 2, maio/ago., 2015, p. 133-150.

Thus, we will analyze the evolution of the concept BRICS, whose initial idea was given by the economist Jim O'Neill of Goldman Sachs. In this sense, the initial idea of O'Neill's study, which aimed to highlight four countries that had high growth rates and with enormous potential, evolved the initiatives that culminated in the BRICS Summits. The goal in this article is to show that this group goes beyond financial and economic issues to approach, among other things, a common security agenda for a fairer multipolar order.

Then, the purpose is to show how the security agenda has evolved in the midst of a group in which there was great emphasis on economic issues. It will be presented the main concerns about the so-called security agenda, as well as the challenges on trying to shape it.

Finally, we will see two examples of the security agenda that emerges within the BRICS, which is the Security Council reform campaign and last, but not less important, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime.

Discourse Analysis and the Power of Words

Discourse analysis is a methodological tool that comes from poststructuralist theory of international relations. (NEUMANN, 2008; HANSEN, 2006). According to Hansen (2006, p. 1) *"poststructuralist discourse analysis can create a theoretically vibrant and rigorous research agenda that speaks to pertinent political issues"*.

Still according to Hansen (2006, p. 1):

It is a research agenda which engages classical questions of foreign policy—how do states generate responses to the problems they face and how do politicians rally support for their calls for action?—as well as bridges to the importance of media and political opposition for how political debates unfold.

On the other hand, according to Neumann (2008, p. 63):

Discourse analysis may start with a specific outcome and demonstrate the preconditions for it happening, demonstrating concurrently that the outcome might have been different. To map these patterns in representations, discourse analysts examine utterances. They may be texts (written statements that do some kind of work in a context).

The descriptive nature that the article presents is an instrument of this

methodological tool. In this sense,

The more such things may be specified empirically, the better the analysis. The ideal is to include as many representations and their variations as possible, and to specify where they are to be found in as high a degree as possible. Methodologically, discourse analysis points to the importance of being explicit about your sweep: the broader it is, the more general knowledge you need, and the less risky it is to leave lacunae (NEUMANN, 2008, p. 62-65).

The methodology used in discourse analysis suggests the reading of texts as essential as well as the definition of the types of texts to be used for reading in accordance with the scope of the approach. In this article, resolutions and speeches taken from the Summit of BRIC. According to Neumann, "*some texts will show up as crossroads or anchor points, such as short government treatises outlining policy. These are called canonical texts or monuments*" (NEUMANN, 2008, p. 67).

What is BRICs?

The term BRIC, an acronym for Brazil, Russia, India and China, was designed in 2001 by Jim O'Neill from the Goldman Sachs US investment bank. In his article entitled "*Building Better Global Economic BRICs*", the economist did not propose or envisioned the formation of a political group or something related but only pointed to the emerging economies that had common elements like economic dimension and considerable growth rates due to its potential (O'NEILL, 2001).

Despite the great diversity among the four countries, the study by O'Neill (2001) pointed out that, within ten years, the weight of the economies of these countries would grow significantly, driven largely by the Chinese economy and GDP. The author also points out that, taking into account the growing importance of the BRIC countries in global economic issues, it would be necessary the rearrangement of policymaking forums, especially the adjustment of the G7, which should incorporate representatives of the BRICs.

Two years later, Dominic Wilson and Roopa Purushothaman (2003) projected in their article entitled "*Dreaming With BRICs: The Path to 2050*" that within 50 years - due to

another study of Goldman Sachs – the BRICs would have the most thriving economies, with projections even to overcome the G6² countries.

Regarding this projections, it is interesting to remember that if these countries in 1950³, representing together 21% of Gross Domestic Product/Purchasing Parity Power (PPP) in the world, while the United States⁴ and Western Europe accounted for respectively 28% and 26%, the BRICS increased in the years 2000-2001 slightly its share in GDP/PPS worldwide, with 23.3%, compared to 21% of States States and 20.3% in Western Europe. In 2008 - a year marked by the spreading of the derivations of the economic crisis - it is remarkable the growth of the group, which now has 28.5% of GDP/PPS, compared to 18.5% US and 17% in Europe Western, as we can see in the table below (Garcia, 2012; Madisson; O'Neill, 2001).

Table 1 - GDP/PPS in the world

	BRICS	US	WESTERN EUROPE
1950	21%	28%	26%
2001	23,3%	21%	20,3%
2008	28,5%	18,5%	17%

Source: Elaborated by the author. Research data

In addition to the status of winner of the War, the United States have been consolidated, since the 1950s, as the world's largest economy. Concomitantly, a fall in GDP of European / global PPC was experienced as a result of two wars. (BRICS POLICY CENTER, 2011a).

Until 2001, the world has experienced many changes, and the configuration observed since 1950 was not maintained; the same can be said of the BRICs that individually have also undergone enormous changes, as territorial reconfigurations due to decolonization process, regime changes, which shows that the participation of these countries that make up the BRIC countries with regard to the participation of GDP / PPC in the world has also changed, but with different peculiarities to each country. Regarding the

2 A group that includes the six countries with the greatest force in the world economic system.

3 Whole URSS to be considered.

4 According to the IMF and Angus Madisson, the percentage of GDP / PPP US in 2001 was 21%, although Jim O'Neill's study brings 24%.

dissemination of policies, economic activities and investments from core states to the periphery, mainly from postwar period, it is possible, as pointed out by Garcia (2012), to realize that the countries that now make up the BRICS could take advantage from this dissemination of activities, which made possible, therefore, the formation of new centers with capacity (both economic, as political) differentiated in relation to other peripheral countries.

Despite the growing importance of these countries for the global economy and also the potential of their markets, much is asked about the possibility of countries with few features in common - cultural, social, political and economical - form a group whose goal is the convergence of interests aimed at linking and coordinating common policies among them. In 2006, a new step was taken, however, about the future of the BRICs. If before there was no linkage mechanism or initiative, the meeting of the Foreign Ministries of the four countries in New York, organized on the sidelines of the 61st General United Nations Assembly on September 23, 2006, can be understood as a first initiative to the group:

Este constituiu o primeiro passo para que Brasil, Rússia, Índia e China começassem a trabalhar coletivamente. Pode-se dizer que, então, em paralelo ao conceito "BRICs" passou a existir um grupo que passava a atuar no cenário internacional, o BRIC⁵ (MINISTÉRIO DAS RELAÇÕES EXTERIORES, 2014).

Over the two years ahead, 2007 and 2008, there were, again, the Foreign Ministers meetings, always on the sidelines of the General Assembly. However, it is undeniable that the framework for the BRICs was the Yekaterinburg Summit in 2009, in Russia, in a context in which the role of these emerging countries was evident, especially if we consider that these countries didn't feel the effects of the global economic crisis (Flemes, 2010; GARCIA, 2012). In subsequent years, each country would host the State Head of the Summit, in a rotating presidency system on the following chronology: Brazil (2010), China⁶ (2012), India (2013), South Africa (2014), Brazil again.

5 This was the first step for Brazil, Russia, India and China begin to work collectively. It can be said, then, in parallel with the term "BRICs" has come to be a group that passed the act on the international stage, the BRIC
6 South Africa became a member of the group. Therefore, from that date, added the S at the end of the acronym BRICS: Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa.

Moreover, a joint statement is issued after each summit raising issues considered essential in various themes, as we can see in the following table, which raises the main points of the summits held between 2009 and 2013.

Meetings and Summits	Main Values
Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International system founded on the rule of law and multilateral diplomacy; • International security and stability; • Equal development opportunities for all countries; • Peaceful settlement of disputes in international relations; • Disarmament and non-proliferation are mutually reinforced; • Avoid arms race in outer space; • South-South cooperation as a complement to traditional forms of development aid;
katerinburg, 2009 Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive, pragmatic, transparent and open dialogue and cooperation; • Construction of a harmonious world of lasting peace and common prosperity.
Brasilia, 2010 Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive, pragmatic, transparent and open dialogue and cooperation; • Construction of a harmonious world of lasting peace and common prosperity; • Peace, Security, Development and Cooperation.
Sanya 2011 Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fairer and more equitable world; • Peace, harmony, cooperation and scientific development;
New Delhi Summit 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peace, security and development in an interdependent multipolar globalized complex world
EThekweni, 2013 Summit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of international law, multilateralism and the UN's central role; • Solidarity among the BRICS; • Peace, stability, global development and cooperation; • inclusive approach of shared solidarity and cooperation with all peoples and nations; • harmonious world with lasting peace and shared prosperity; • Peace, security, development and cooperation.

Source: LOPES, 2013, p. 31 (translated by the author)

Ekaterinburg Summit, the first formal meeting of BRIC countries, highlighted the political character that the group was about to take. Priority issues were adopted related to economic agenda

Grupos especializados do BRIC serão postos em marcha nas áreas prioritárias a presente crise financeira e econômica, assuntos do FMI, reservas de divisas e o estímulo do comércio intra-BRIC, finanças, investimentos, agricultura e segurança energética⁷ (FLEMES, 2010, p. 149).

In a troubled political situation, marked, for example, by the crisis in Georgia and Kosovo, the summit in Russia meant a time when the BRIC countries had, according to Flandes (2010), great resources to counterbalance the United States. Also according to the author, many analysts understood these initiatives as Kremlin's response to Washington, which signaled that Russia was no longer welcome as a member of the G8. Understood as political success of Russian diplomacy, it became clear that the political clubs could be formed without the US presence - whose geopolitical implications as soon unleashed right afterwards, for example, when India and China have positioned themselves for Russia on the Kosovo issue.

Regarding the economic crisis, it is important to highlight the performance of BRIC countries and the "mudanças das relações hierárquicas de poder e possibilidade de reforma das instituições internacionais⁸ (Garcia, 2012, p.30)". The G20 would take leading role to become the central forum for coordination between countries, diminishing the importance of the G8; Moreover, emerging countries are seeking to change "from within" (GARCIA, 2012, P. 30). This change is evident in the following passage:

Se, antes da crise, os "países emergentes" buscavam criar fóruns e articulações entre si, alternativos aos dos países centrais, após a crise, sua estratégia teria mudado para uma ação diplomática mais direta, advogando por reformas na arquitetura global. O resultado esperado dessa nova estratégia seria uma difusão do poder e da influência internacional, que pode

⁷ Specialized groups of BRIC will be put in place in the priority areas the present financial and economic crisis, the IMF affairs, foreign exchange reserves and the intra-BRIC trade stimulus, finance, investment, agriculture and energy security

⁸ Change of hierarchical power relations and the possibility of reform of international institutions

levar a uma ordem mais diversificada, e uma estrutura de governança descentralizada, com múltiplos centros e níveis⁹ (GARCIA, 2012, p. 30).

In a broader sense, we can bring up that with all the changes which the group has passed since their first date, even in the mid-2000s, and despite all the differences that the group can present, the role of the BRICS internationally, especially in the post-crisis context, it is notable. In this regard, if we were to point to a relevant common interest to the group, it would be just as Flandes (2010): a demand for greater representation, more democratic and more active voice, especially in global financial institutions. The dissatisfaction of the BRICS countries with the current status quo is obvious, since the existing order and its institutions do not reflect the changes that have occurred in recent years.

Lula da Silva declarou que chegou o tempo de as instituições multilaterais refletirem esta importância e que os países BRIC devem trabalhar em conjunto para “mudar a geografia política e comercial do mundo”¹⁰ (FLEMES, 2010, p. 150).

Since these countries do not have sufficient resources to impose their will against the strongest, especially the United States, they resort, however, to *soft-balancing* (Flandes, 2010; GARCIA, 2012). By involving institutional strategies, such as the formation of coalitions (BRICS, IBSA, G3, G4, G21), and seeking balance of system “por meio de cooperação, entendimentos informais e colaboração em instituições¹¹” (GARCIA, 2012, p. 35), these states try to increase US political costs in the forums and institutions. These countries have consistently used these non-military elements and mechanisms as a way to offset, delay and mitigate the US policy, which, in addition to increasing the scope of those countries, strengthens the group (Flandes, 2010; GARCIA, 2012).

⁹ If, before the crisis, “emerging countries” were seeking to create forums and joints with each other, an alternative to the core countries, after the crisis, its strategy had changed to a more direct diplomatic action, advocating for reforms in the global architecture. The expected result of this new strategy would be a diffusion of power and international influence, which can lead to a more diverse order, and a decentralized governance structure, with multiple centers and levels.

¹⁰ Lula da Silva said the time has come to multilateral institutions reflect this importance and that the BRIC countries should work together to “change the political and trade geography of the world”

¹¹ Through cooperation, informal understandings and collaboration institutions

Developing a Security Agenda

From the time when there is increasing scope of BRICS, following the trend of increased participation of these countries in an increasingly important context as well in strengthening the coordination of activities, new challenges appear regarding the issues of international relations, especially taking into account that preferences not always converge.

Even if the rise of the BRICS group has been given to economic issues and concerns, it should be understood that there is growing interest in the security agenda that can be evidenced from the presented demands and shared values in the joint statements issued at the summits of BRIC, for example. The question raised here relates to how these countries, whose interests focused on the security area sometimes so different, could concatenate their ambitions.

First of all it is necessary to point out the values shared by the BRICS about the international system. After the meeting of ministers of the BRIC Foreign Affairs in 2008, the statement made clear a very idealistic character, in which the group supported an international system based in multilateralism, respecting international law, based on the peaceful resolution of disputes, with the UN as a leading organization in maintaining world order and a shared vision that considers the concerns of countries as a group in relation to safety. These are the parameters that BRIC is willing to work together with other States in order to constitute a stable environment, equal opportunities for development, aimed at strengthening the security. More specifically, two items were approached in relation to concerns in this area: the nuclear non-proliferation issue and terrorism. Regarding the first, it should never be dissociated from disarmament; the latter must be fought hard and condemned in all its forms to be considered as one of the most serious threats to peace. For proper treatment of both the UN makes itself indispensable (BRIC MINISTERIAL COMMUNIQUE, 2008; BRICS POLICY CENTER, 2011b).

In the context of Heads of State Summit meeting held in Ekaterinburg, Russia in 2009, the Joint Communiqué has not brought big news regarding the Security agenda. In this document, there is great emphasis on social issues, such as the provision of

international humanitarian assistance and reduction of risks of natural disasters, and the advancement of cooperation in science and education fields. Terrorism was mentioned again, asking the United Nations General Assembly to accelerate the procedures for the "Comprehensive Convention against International Terrorism", approved on an emergency basis. Another interesting point mentioned concerns on recognition by China and Russia of the important role played by Brazil and India in international affairs, supporting even the Indo-Brazilian aspirations for a more active participation in the United Nations (JOINT STATEMENT OF THE BRIC COUNTRIES' LEADERS, 2009; BRICS POLICY CENTER, 2011b).

In 2010, at the Second Summit of Heads of State, held in Brasilia, Brazil, the Joint Declaration did not bring news in the security field once again. In a large document, the economic area was one of the most emphasized, highlighting the central role of the G20 in tackling the crisis through strong policy coordination and reiterating the vindication of a larger and more active participation of developing countries in the forums and global economic organizations. Terrorism was, again, quoted, with heads of State calling for the prevention of terrorist acts, as well as repression and fight against its financing (DECLARAÇÃO CONJUNTA DA II CÚPULA DE CHEFES DE ESTADO, 2010; BRICS POLICY CENTER, 2011b).

The following year was China's turn to host the Heads of State Summit, which marked the entry of South Africa in BRICS. The Sanya Declaration, also endowed with an idealist bias - which emphasizes peace, harmony and cooperation - brings new items related to safety. In addition to reinforcing the importance of BRICS for peace, security and stability, the group, strongly grounded in a commitment to multilateralism, defended the need for a comprehensive reform of the United Nations, including the Security Council in order to ensure their greater efficiency and representativeness. This demonstration in favor of reform is, however, very general, since it does not cite how the reform should be made, not even proposes how the participation of Brazil, India and South Africa in this process should be made. It must be considered, however, that the adhesion of China and Russia for reform of the UN Security Council strengthened the position of those who long for a permanent seat - even if, by 2014, has not been great advance in this demand.

Something that was understood as an excellent opportunity for BRICS was the fact that, coincidentally, the five countries that make up the forum were present at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). This was an important occasion in which the group could work, coordinated and jointly, on peace and security issues. It was also expressed concern for the consequences of the Arab Spring and the disputes in the Middle East, Maghreb and West Africa. The case of Libya is specifically mentioned, reinforcing the relative continuity of cooperation on the subject within the UNSC. The group advocated the need for dialogue between the parties involved, while respecting the role that regional organizations can and should exercise.

Terrorism was again mentioned at the end of the reported negotiations. This time, the UN's role as a central actor to coordinate action against terrorism was highlighted, and the group also called for the fast conclusion of the negotiations within the United Nations General Assembly of the Global Convention on International Terrorism. Finally, there is the introduction of a new subject that, because of the high risks involved, has gained enough prominence in international relations: cyber crimes. Despite being mentioned quickly, the issue has generated enough concern to countries, and the group attributed special attention to the issue and signed a commitment to fight it. (DECLARAÇÃO DE SANYA, 2011; BRICS POLICY CENTER, 2011b).

In 2012, the Summit took place in India, and the Declaration of Delhi was prepared on the discussions on "Stability, Security and Prosperity." With regard to security, the regions of the Middle East and the Maghreb were again addressed in the document, recognizing the importance to establish peace, stability and security in these regions. There is a latent concern about the developments and the postponement of the "long-lasting conflicts," beyond the commitment mention with a fair solution in relation to the Arab-Israeli conflict, first mentioned topic within the Forum. BRICS charge and consider greater involvement of the United Nations Security Council in the search for resolution of the conflict; gives further importance to direct negotiations between the parties involved to reach final solutions.

BRICS also expressed concerns about the situation in Syria, calling for the immediate end of the violence that has been established in the country as well as repudiating human rights violations. Another point mentioned in the Declaration was the Iran situation and the worrying possibility of climbing into the conflict, which would bring dire consequences for the international system. The BRICS have recognized the right of Iran to develop nuclear energy for peaceful use while ensuring observance of the obligations and the political and diplomatic decisions between the parties, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and follow the resolutions of the Security Council United Nations.

The group manifested itself on Afghanistan and acknowledged the progress made towards achieving a peaceful state with stability and democracy, free of terrorism, which is still under reconstruction process, which requires time, care and commitment from the International community. Finally, there is a topic on terrorism with no major changes compared to what was presented in the previous Summit (DECLARAÇÃO DE NOVA DÉLI, 2012).

In 2013, the V Summit of Heads of State was held in the South African city of Durban. The Declaration of e-eThekweni brings the shared understanding that the UN is the main multilateral forum mandated to ensure peace, hope, order and development to the world. Taking into account all the changes that have occurred recently, BRICS consider necessary comprehensive reform not only of the UN but also of its main decision-making body, the Security Council. Just as mentioned in the Declaration of Sanya, there is no more specific indication of these reforms although China and Russia reiterate the importance of Brazil, India and South Africa.

The BRICS reiterated their strong concern about the security and human rights in Syria and positioned themselves against the immediate militarization of the conflict, as this could pose serious risks to people, as well as being contrary to the values shared by the BRICS. In addition, the group welcomed the admission of Palestine as UN observer state, but remained concerned about the Middle East peace process, since there was no progress between Israel and Palestine. Countries positioned itself in favor of a two-state solution based on pre-1967 borders.

On the Iranian nuclear issue – question already approached in the previous summit - the BRICS showed a little concern about the threats of use of force, as well as the threats of unilateral sanctions; they still believe, however, on a solution to the Iranian nuclear program through diplomatic channels. Regarding Afghanistan, the text remains virtually identical. In addition, there is a mention of the worrying situation of instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo despite reiterating belief in regional organizations to ensure peace and security in that country. Once again the group condemns terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. As for cybercrime, the group emphasizes the need for security of networks because the Internet plays an important role in promoting development; the group emphasizes, therefore, the search for safe use of this technology by means of norms, standards and practices organized in a universally accepted system (DECLARAÇÃO DE E-THAKWINI, 2013).

The nuclear non-proliferation regime was central to the security agenda in the post-Cold War mainly to the Western powers and Russia, being the great concern directly associated with the use of weapons of mass destruction and the perception of threats terrorists. Taking into account the whole evolution of the regime and the adoption of the Additional Protocol for nuclear inspections, the concern to strengthen it and reform it with a view to its legitimacy is evident. In this context, it presents enormous challenges with regard to the regime and its mechanisms, which are configured from disparate stances of the group members (HERZ & COUTINHO, 2011).

South Africa, the only country that, after developing nuclear weapons, renounced them voluntarily, positions itself in favor of the non-proliferation regime. The country, holder of two operative nuclear reactors, joined the NPT in 1991; considers, however, that the nuclear power development is essential for diversification of primary energy resources and may represent an important element in mitigating the effects of climate change (HERZ & COUTINHO, 2011).

China's policy on nuclear weapons has strong relationship with its regional context, its geopolitical role in Asia, relations with India and also with the United States. Currently, its positioning, conditioned by the development of nuclear weapons, is strongly associated

Conjuntura Global, Vol. 4, n. 2, maio/ago., 2015, p. 133-150. 145

with the huge energy potential of the country - representing an innovation by providing the theme, traditionally treated as a matter of security and economics. (HERZ & COUTINHO, 2011).

Russia, currently the second-largest nuclear power in the world after the United States, is positioned opposed to nuclear proliferation; there is, however, no evidence that will open up its nuclear arsenal - though initiatives arising from bilateral relations with the United States, to control nuclear weapons, such as New Start, agreement signed in 2011 between Obama and Medvedev (HERZ & COUTINHO, 2011).

Brazil, which joined the NPT only in 1998, adopts the nuclear defense policy of peaceful use of technology. The country, which sought to develop an independent nuclear industry over the last six decades, develops submarine construction design of nuclear propulsion and sees the potential of this type of energy for its headquarters; it is noteworthy, however, reluctance of Brazilian diplomacy with respect to the Additional Protocol. To some sectors of External Relations Ministry, the adhesion opposes Brazil's national interest. (HERZ & COUTINHO, 2011).

Finally, India is presented as the most complex case from the examples mentioned, the only member country of the BRICS not to accede to the NPT. Despite the non-adherence to the regime - and regarded source of perpetuation of inequality between countries - the country positions itself for disarmament as well as nuclear non-proliferation. Historically, the question is difficult to treat in India, and nuclear weapons are central to its defense strategy, which has very delicate relations with its neighbors, especially Pakistan (HERZ & COUTINHO, 2011).

CONCLUSION

The idea of BRIC(S) emerged in 2001 after the Jim O'Neill of Goldman Sachs report on a group of four countries that in addition to large territory and population, had tremendous growth rates and great potential markets. However, following the initiative of

the Minister of Russian Foreign Affairs Minister Sergei Lavrov, the group walked to allocate a political character to the group and, in 2006, was held the first activity that brought together the foreign ministers of Brazil, Russia, India and China on the sidelines of the 62nd United Nations General Assembly.

The following years were essential for the group, because besides the regularity of the meetings, the group saw its presence and influence increase in a context where the strong economic crisis had serious consequences for the United States and Europe. Thus, much due to the role played by these countries during the economic crisis, the Group further increased its importance. With the Summits of Heads of State being held from year to year, their demands happen mainly in the economic field. With the goal of a remodeling of the global economic system architecture, the group managed to get some successes, such as the G20, which has shown an important mechanism during the crisis.

However, as presented, despite the strong emphasis on economic and financial agenda, the security area was gradually gaining importance, and accordingly, the Sanya Declaration represents a milestone for the group. From the declarations and communiqués, the picture is that the BRICS share an idealistic view of the world in which multilateralism is considered essential for ensuring the stability, peace, security and possibility of development. However, at the time that the interest in the security field increases in order to present similarities and shared values, new challenges arise in relation to the idea of a common security agenda, and that is evident from the cases presented: UN's Security Council and nuclear non-proliferation regime.

REFERENCES

BRICS Policy Center; *Núcleo de Sistemas de Inovação e Governança do Desenvolvimento. Desenvolvimento desigual e mudanças estruturais na economia mundial: a evolução da participação dos BRICS no PIB global, de 1900 a 2008*. Policy Brief, 2011a. Available in: <http://bricspolicycenter.org/homolog/uploads/trabalhos/940/doc/1786116251.pdf> Accessed on: 23/08/2015;

BRICS POLICY CENTER. *Núcleo de Política Internacional e Agenda Multilateral. Os BRICS e a Segurança Internacional*. Policy Brief, 2011b. Available in: <http://bricspolicycenter.org/homolog/uploads/trabalhos/967/doc/5183057.pdf> Accessed on: 23/08/2015;

FLEMES, Daniel. *O Brasil na iniciativa BRIC: soft balancing numa ordem global em mudança?* Rev. Bras. Polít. Int., v. 53, n. 1, p. 141-156, 2010;

FUNDO MONETÁRIO INTERNACIONAL (FMI). *The World Economic Outlook (WEO) Database May 2001*. Available in: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2001/01/data/> Accessed on: 13/08/2015;

GAMA, C. F. P. S. *Definindo BRICS: a recategorização do internacional e o questionamento do global, para além do revisionismo e do reformismo*. In: Encontro Nacional ABRI, 2011, Sao Paulo. Anais do encontro, p. 1-18.

GARCIA, Ana Saggiaro. *A internacionalização de empresas brasileiras durante o governo Lula: uma análise crítica da relação entre capital e Estado no Brasil contemporâneo*. 2012. Tese (doutorado) - Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Relações Internacionais, Rio de Janeiro

HANSEN, Lene. *Security as Practice: discourse analysis and the Bosnian War*. Londres: Routledge, 2006.

HERZ, Monica; **LAGE**, Victor Coutinho. *BRICS e Questão Nuclear: Contestações e Rearfirmações diante dos Mecanismos de Governança Global*. Carta Internacional, v.6, n.2, p. 31-54, 2011.

LEÃO, Valdemar Carneiro. *BRICS: identidade e agenda econômica*. In: **PIMENTEL**, José Vicente. *O Brasil, os BRICS e a agenda internacional*. Brasília: FUNAG, 2012.

LOPES, Rafael Bittencourt Rodrigues. *FORMAÇÃO E CONTINUIDADE DE COALIZÕES ENTRE POTÊNCIAS EMERGENTES: O BRICS COMO ESTUDO DE CASO*. Available in: <http://www.pordentrodaafrica.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Monografia-Rafael-Bittencourt.pdf>

MADDISON, Angus. New Maddison Project Database. Available in: Conjuntura Global, Vol. 4, n. 2, maio/ago., 2015, p. 133-150.

<<http://www.ggcd.net/maddison/maddison-project/data.htm>>

MINISTERIO DE RELACOES EXTERIORES (MRE). BRICS: Brasil, Rússia, Índia, China e África do Sul. Available in: <<http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/temas/mecanismos-inter-regionais/agrupamento-brics>>

NEUMANN, I. B. *Qualitative Methods in International Relations – a Pluralist Guide*. Editado por Audie Klotz e Deepa Prakash. Department of Political Science, The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, USA: Editora Palgrave Macmillan, Fevereiro de 2008, cap. 5 p.s 61-77

O'NEILL, Jim. *Building Better Global Economic BRICs*. Goldman Sachs. Global Economics Paper No: 66, p. 16, 2001.

WILSON, Dominic; PURUSHOTHAMAN, Roopa. *Dreaming With BRICs: The Path to 2050*. Goldman Sachs. Global Economics Paper No: 99, 2003.

Comunicado conjunto da reunião de Ministros das Relações Exteriores. Ecaterimburgo, Rússia, 16 de maio de 2008. Available in: < <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/temas-mais-informacoes/saiba-mais-bric/documentos-emitidos-pelos-chefes-de-estado-e-de-governo-pelos-chanceleres/comunicado-ministerial-do-bric>>.

Comunicado Conjunto dos Líderes dos Países BRIC. Ecaterimburgo, Rússia, 16 de junho de 2009. Available in: < <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/temas-mais-informacoes/saiba-mais-bric/documentos-emitidos-pelos-chefes-de-estado-e-de-governo-pelos-chanceleres/comunicado-i-cupula-bric>>.

Declaração Conjunta da II Cúpula de Chefes de Estado/Governo dos BRIC. Brasília, Brasil, 15 de abril de 2010. Available in: < <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/temas-mais-informacoes/saiba-mais-bric/documentos-emitidos-pelos-chefes-de-estado-e-de-governo-pelos-chanceleres/ii-bric-summit-joint-statement>>.

Declaração de Sanya do Encontro de Líderes BRICS. Sanya, Hainan, China, 14 de abril de 2011. Available in: < <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/temas-mais-informacoes/saiba-mais-bric/documentos-emitidos-pelos-chefes-de-estado-e-de-governo-pelos-chanceleres/iii-cupula-dos-brics-declaracao-de-sanya>>.

Declaração de Nova Delhi da IV Cúpula dos BRICS. Nova Delhi, Índia, 29 de março de 2012. Available in: < <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/sala-de-imprensa/notas-a-imprensa/quarta-cupula-dos-brics-nova-delhi-29-de-marco-de-2012-parceria-dos-brics-para-a-estabilidade-seguranca-e-prosperidade-declaracao-de-nova-delhi>>. Acesso: em 16 jul. 2014

Declaração de eThekwini da V Cúpula do BRICS. Durban, África do Sul, 27 de março de 2013. Available in: < <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/sala-de-imprensa/notas-a-imprensa/v-cupula-do-brics-durban-27-de-marco-de-2013-declaracao-de-ethekwini>>.